REPORT RESUMES

ED 011 021

UD 002 466

PRESCHOOL CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS IN DISADVANTAGED AREAS OF NEW YORK CITY--SUMMER 1966.

BY- SCHWARTZ, SYDNEY

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE 31 AUG 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$3.76 94P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED, ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, *PRESCHOOL CHILDREN, SELF CONCEPT, FACILITIES, LEARNING, SCHOOL ATTITUDES, STUDENT TEACHER RELATIONSHIP, GUIDANCE PERSONNEL, PERSONNEL, TRAINING, QUESTIONNAIRES, *EVALUATION, TEACHER EXPERIENCE, ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS, SUMMER PROGRAMS, *EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, ORIENTATION, NEW YORK CITY, ESEA TITLE I PROJECT, HEADSTART

AN EVALUATION WAS MADE OF THE SUCCESS OF A PROGRAM FOR DISADVANTAGED PRESCHOOL CHILDREN ESTABLISHED TO ENHANCE THEIR SELF-CONCEPT, INCREASE THEIR LEARNING ABILITY, AND FOSTER IN THEM A POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL. THE PROGRAM FOCUSED ON THE INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF THE CHILDREN AND TEACHERS AND ON THE CURRICULUM IN THE 38 PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS. DATA WERE GATHERED ON A SELECTED REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE BY OBSERVATION AND INTERVIEWERS' PERSONAL REPORTS. SOME OF THE FINDINGS WERE--(1) THE PROGRAM SUCCEEDED BEST IN CREATING POSITIVE FEELINGS ABOUT SCHOOL BUT WAS LEAST EFFECTIVE IN DEVELOPING THE CHILDREN'S ABILITY TO THINK AND REASON, (2) DESPITE THE PROBLEMS INHERENT IN THE SWIFT ORGANIZATION OF A HUGE, COMPLEX PROGRAM, THE NEED WAS STILL GREAT FOR REFINEMENT IN RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF PERSONNEL, COOPERATION IN ADMINISTRATIVE PLANNING, COMMUNICATION BETWEEN REGULAR AND SUMMER STAFFS, MORE GUIDANCE STAFF, AND BETTER USE OF AUXILIARY PROFESSIONALS, AND (3) MORE STAFF ORIENTATION AND GUIDANCE WAS NEEDED. INCLUDED IN THE REPORT WERE VARIOUS QUESTIONNAIRES, DATA SHEETS, AND INTERVIEW GUIDES FOR BOTH THE CHILD CENTERS AND HEADSTART PROGRAMS. (NH)

ED011021

18

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Nathan Brown, Associate Director

Evaluation of New York City School District educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) - performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1965-66 School Year.

Joseph Krevisky
Research Coordinator, Title I Projects

PRE-SCHOOL CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS IN DISADVANTAGED AREAS OF NEW YORK CITY- SUMMER 1966

Dr. Sydney Schwartz
Research Director

August 31, 1966

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 002416

92

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	. . . .	1
Chapter I	Objectives of the Evaluation	4
Chapter II	Methodology and Data Collection	4
Chapter III	Findings:	
	Part 1: Staffing of the Child Development Centers.	14
	Part 2: Structure	22
	Part 3: Educational Programs	45
Chapter IV	Conclusions and Recommendations	56
Appendix	Staff Page....................................	60

INTRODUCTION

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Child Development Center Program emerged from the fact that "recent studies have established that children from economically and socially disadvantaged families...have not had the experiences which foster curiosity and develop the speaking and listening skills...they do not have a positive attitude toward themselves."(1) Thus, the objectives of the program as outlined in the project description include:

1. Improving the child's health.
2. The development of a better self-concept through encouraging self-confidence, self-expression, self-discipline, curiosity and a chance of success. Such chances may erase patterns of frustration and failure and especially the fear of failure.
3. Increasing the child's capacity to learn by improving and expanding the child's ability to think, reason and speak clearly. Wider and more varied experiences will be provided to broaden the children's horizons.
4. Increasing the child's ability to get along with others in his family, including the development of a responsible attitude toward society in the child and his family.
5. Planning activities which allow groups from every social, ethnic and economic level in a community to join together with the poor in solving problems.
6. Developing in the child a more positive attitude toward school.(2)

The design of the Child Development Centers toward the achievement of of these goals included:

1. A daily three-hour program , including lunch, to be housed in the public elementary schools of New York City: Basic room equipment existing in the public schools to be supplemented by Board of Education for the summer programs.
2. Selected schools in attendance areas having high concentrations of low income families.

---

1 & 2: Project description: Board of Education of the City of New York
1: p 1 2: p 6.

3. Class groups of no more than 15 children per group under the direction of a professionally educated group teacher; auxiliary classroom help to consist of an assistant teacher selected from the current college population, and an aide selected from the local community of the center. Assignment of volunteers will also be made where available.

4. Coordination of centers to be under the direction of professionally educated head teachers who will receive supervision and guidance from an area supervisor of the Bureau of Early Childhood Education.

5. Professional staff to be selected from the body of Early Childhood and Elementary Teachers in the New York City Public School System.

6. Orientation sessions to be designed and administered to all teaching personnel by the urban colleges. Family assistants will receive their orientation from the Board of Education.

7. Auxiliary professional services to be provided which will include medical and dental care for the children; psychiatric and psychological consultants, and a social worker will also be available.

8. The community action program to be structured and supervised by a team of family assistants and family workers directed toward providing expanded educational opportunities to the parents through the school facilities.

Approximately 30,000 children from economically underprivileged homes were to participate in this project, utilizing approximately 262 schools.

The children were to be enrolled from the population of potential school entrants for the fall of 1966; i.e., 5 and 6 year old children.

INDEX OF TABLES

TABLE I Professional Teaching Personnel: Experience and Regular School Assignment Page 24
TABLE II Housing Equipment and Supplies Page 30
Table III Availability and Evaluation of Auxiliary Professional Personnel Page 34-35
TABLE IV Enrollment, Attrition, Attendance, Availability of Volunteers and Population Served Page 40
TABLE V Educational Accomplishments of the Summer Program; and Major Reasons for These Accomplishments as Perceived by the Professional Teaching Staff Page 47
TABLE VI General Summary: Teaching Behavior Page 52
TABLE VII Children's Behavior in the Classroom Page 55

CHAPTER I

OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The specific directive for this evaluation program was that of assessing the relative success of the educational programs of the Child Development Centers in terms of the stated goals of the summer program.

As described in the original proposal summarized in the Introduction, the educational goals involved fostering the growth of the participant children by enhancing their self-concept, increasing their ability to learn, and establishing a positive attitude toward the school.

Although the major factor influencing the attainment of these goals is the classroom teaching situation, the total operational structure of the Child Development Center is integrally involved. The level of success in staffing (including selection and orientation), housing, equipping, supervising, recruiting children, and offering of auxiliary services directly affected the quality of experiences offered the youngers in each classroom.

Therefore, it was considered a part of this evaluational research to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the total planning and operational structure relative to the identified successes within the educational context.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION

Part I: Selection of the sample population

It was hypothesized that an evaluatory study of a qualitative nature could best be secured through a selected sampling representative of the total number of schools participating in the Child Development Center Program.

This representative sampling of the 262 schools in New York City was selected by employing the following criteria:

1. Concentration of low income families in the area, (Poverty Pockets).
2. Geographic location, including school districting.
3. School year enrollment: i.e. over-enrolled, normal or under-enrolled schools.
4. Extent of school year program: pre-kindergarten programs.
5. Size of Center: 60-120 children.

Criteria for Selection of School

Information was secured from the Neighborhood Youth Corps which provided the statistical data facilitating the isolation of those geographical areas where there was a significant concentration of families with incomes below the established poverty line ($4,000 per annum).

It was decided that four boroughs of New York City should be sampled for representativeness. Richmond County (Staten Island) was excluded because of its physical separation from the other boroughs and its normative amount of deprived families. This led the staff to believe that there were no crucial differences to be found there that were not represented in the other boroughs.

From 1-3 schools were to be sampled in a given geographic area based upon the percentage of low income (poverty level)families residing in that locale. The distribution was as follows:

.....from 7.5 percent to 10 percent low income families- -	3 schools
.....from 5 percent to 7.4 percent low income families - -	2 schools
.... from 1 percent to 4.9 percent low income families - -	1 school

In addition to the consideration of income level, school year enrollment, the existence of kindergarten and pre-kindergarten programs and the size of the Summer Center were deemed significant.

The procedure for selection of this sampling required the mapping of those poverty areas in relation to school districting lines. All schools with Child Development Center Programs were cited. In cases where single selections were indicated, a school centrally located in that area was selected. In those districts where multiple selections were necessary, a distribution was sought to include schools that would draw from the total population of that area with diversity in school year enrollment and differences in school year programs.

In total, 35 schools (a 13 percent sampling) were selected. The list of selected schools are as follows:

Brooklyn:

Crown Heights	#289
Fort Greene	#46
Red Hook	#30
Williamsburg	#196
Williamsburg	#16
Bedford-Stuyvesant	#157
	#28
East New York	#213
Brownsville	#184
	#41
Greenpoint	#34

Manhattan:

East Harlem	#7
	101
	168
Lower East Side	#31
	15
	122
Lower West Side	#23
Chelsea	#11
Central Harlem	#170
	76
	90
Upper West Side	#166
	161
	129

Bronx:

South Bronx	#29
	154
Morrisania	63
	39
Hunters Point	#48

Queens:

South Jamaica	#40
Rockaways	#42
Corona	#92
Springfield Gardens	#15

Selection of Classrooms:

Since the sample population included centers with anticipated enrollment of 4 groups or 8 groups (60 children or 120 children), the staff decided to select one morning class group and one afternoon class group, with different group teachers as representative of the educational programs of the selected centers. In those centers where there were four groups in attendance both morning and afternoon, two teachers were randomly selected by the evaluator for observation. Beyond the initial identification of the school and the selected teachers, all sources of data were numerically coded to insure the anonymity of the respondents.

Section 2: Instrumentation

In considering the possible scope of an evaluation of educational programs in Child Development Centers, a variety of questions were raised.

First, there were concerns dealing with the structure and functioning of the Centers. It was necessary to ascertain whether the centers were in reality equipped with the personnel, facilities, materials and supplies as indicated in the proposal. Did these centers adhere to the structural pattern which was proposed?

A second area of evaluation included a consideration of the appropriateness of the structural plan in terms of the specific goals and operational realities of the New York City Child Development Centers. It was not considered the task of the evaluational project to seek a theoretical answer to this aspect. Rather, the evaluational procedures were directed to seeking data from the Center personnel that would offer pertinent information concerning vital roles unfulfilled and/or duplicated.

The final area of consideration referrent to the structure of the Child Development Centers was how adequately and appropriately the roles of the personnel as assigned were understood and effectuated.

Several factors called for the delineation of the extent of the evaluational procedures. The two most crucial of these factors were:

1. The explicit task of evaluating the educational program at the Child Development Center rather than the total Center activities, and
2. The time available to conduct the evaluation: Since the evaluation program was initiated one week prior to the onset of the summer program, the task of acquiring a qualified group of professionals, developing the plan and instrumentation, and executing the procedures was restricted to 8 weeks.

It was felt that the nature of the instrumentation, as well as the selection of evaluators who would use the data collecting devices, was a crucial aspect of the total reliability and validity of the evaluational project. By virtue of the nature of the data, the design and instrumentation of this study was conceived as essentially a qualitative analysis of the Child Development Center Program. Emphasis was placed on the objectification of evaluation, wherever possible, through the use of rigorous recording devices and scientific orientation of highly skilled professional personnel in their use.

In the design of the instruments two basic sources of data were sought; a) observation and b) personal reports.

The perceived limitations of the instrumentation related to the circumstances pertinent to the study rather than the data collecting techniques employed. The limitations of the time factor permitted no more than two visits to a center within the defined eight week period. This restriction on potential visits was taken into consideration as a liability. This liability was acknowledged as a reality factor which could not be altered and thus emphasis was to be placed on the quality of the available observation and interview time. The goal was defined as the establishment of rapport and the gaining of insight into the various aspects of the summer program. Two observer visits could not adequately consider such developmental and dynamic factors as child growth, variations of temperament in a classroom, the scope of the curriculum, etc. As to the realities of obtaining classroom observational material, the first and last week of the summer session were excluded, leaving a span of six weeks for that part of the evaluation which relied upon observational data.

Additionally, this limiting time factor prohibited the pre-testing of the instruments for inter-observer reliability. It was therefore deemed essential that a variety of instruments be devised that would provide a crosscheck of the defined areas. These instruments were developed in conference with the total professional staff to allow for maximum comprehension of the discrete parts of the instruments both in theory and use under the prescribed conditions.*

The instruments took the form of (a) observational recordings and (b) personal reports, including interviews and questionnaires.

Observational Instruments:

The types of information needed to be secured through observation was apparent as a vital part of the design and methodology of the study. The need for concomitantly effective recording instruments to direct organize and, in degree, standardize the observational data was also evident. It was taken into account that, though primary observational data is essential in a study of this nature, some compensation must be made for the subjective aspect of this type of data collection which tends to bring forth manifestations of personal pre-judgements.

---

*Two of the observational instruments were not developed by the research team; Teacher Profile and General Teacher Summary. Both instruments have been recently developed as a part of an on-going pre-kindergarten curriculum study under the direction of Professor Kenneth D. Wann and Professor Helen F. Robison at Teachers College, Columbia University. As new instruments, they have been tested only for inter-observer reliability, by the original researchers.

These personal pre-judgement of the observers were minimized by a careful selection of highly qualified personnel who were experienced evaluators and/or researchers accustomed to supervision and participant-observation in early childhood settings.* Additionally, preliminary meetings were devoted to the sharing and exchanging of professional convictions and perceptions directed toward finding an appropriately acceptable level of operation. There was team participation in the development of the instruments with concurrence on all items of the newly developed instruments.

Emphasis was placed on achieving a desirable level of objectivity of observation with focus placed on the specific aspects of teacher behavior, children's behavior and curriculum content. From the observational point of view, patterns of teacher behavior and patterns of child behavior were described rather than a series of isolated incidents. The objective of this study was not directed toward evaluating growth over a period of time, but rather a study of the way in which the teacher related to the children and the way the children related to the teacher, the group and the curriculum. This decision was a direct outgrowth of the team's appraisal of the goals of "Headstart" as outlined in the proposal (cited in introduction).

*Staff members were selected by the evaluation coordinator in terms of the following criteria:

a. extensive knowledge and experience in the field of early childhood education,
b. additional specialized knowledge from the social sciences and related disciplines
c. diversity in personal background of the staff

Staff structure was selected to give the greatest weight to the knowledge and experience in teaching and administration of programs for young children 4,5 and 6 years of age. The following list of staff indicates professional competencies, specialities and auxiliary skills as related to the evaluation task:

4 Early Childhood Education Specialists: directors of New York City day care centers, private preschool, kindergarten and early elementary programs
1 language development expert: recent participant in a two year curriculum experimental project for 4-5 yr. olds

2 psychologists: public school and research experience
1 social worker: experienced in working with poverty population
1 sociologist: experienced as consultant and supervisor of pre-service teachers, early childhood and elementary levels.

All personnel contributed to the project through professional competencies in their own field plus competencies in the expanded social science field. Except for the sociologist, all members of the evaluating team, including the coordinator, participated in the collection of the data. The sociologist did not visit the centers in order to allow for objectivity in data analysis by one member of the group, most appropriately this member.

The description of group and individual development was eliminated as a primary goal of this evaluational study due, again, to the limitations of time and the lack of availability of reliable tests that could realistically be administered. Under the circumstances, the staff felt that the most important consideration was the quality of experience for the children in terms of the school environment. It was further deemed that quality can be described and analyzed at a given point in time.

The variety of observational instruments designed by the evaluating team was directed toward providing a cross-check for each observer by structuring observations to include:

1. observations of the teacher in action accompanied by a general personality summary (see footnote, p.6.)
2. observations of the children's behavior in relation to the teacher and key parts of the curriculum
3. observations of the content of the program as evidenced by teacher-initiated comments or responses during the flexible free play period.

One of the major concerns of this part of the evaluation was the need to describe the quality of the relationship that was established between the group teacher and the children in reference to specifically defined areas: (1) the emotional-social level and (2) the intellectual level.

Objectification of the description of teacher behavior was required in the instrument headed "Teacher Profile".* The observer's attention was directed to an appropriate categorization of a series of acts of the teacher at specified intervals throughout the observation period. Observers needed to delineate between those acts which were instructional in nature and those acts which were emotional-social in nature. Further breakdown of analysis called for categorization of the quality of the instructional moves and the behavorial moves. Paired with this "Teacher Profile" was an instrument by which the observer summarized the general personality of the teacher in terms of kindliness, supportiveness, and verbal and stimulative levels.

A further check on the rating comprising intellectual stimulation was offered by the instrument dealing with curriculum content. It was assumed that the teachers were continually offering content to the children as a part of the daily defined group period. The significance of this kind of intellectual exposure could not be ascertained under the circumstances of the limited number of observational recordings. However, the amount of content that was being reflected by teacher behavior in the flexible free play period could begin to indicate the appropriateness and meaningfulness of content as the children were involved with materials and activities of their own choosing. Further, there could be some description of scope of content as enhanced by the teacher.

PERSONAL REPORTS

The need for interviews was apparent to the staff. Studying a point in time required detail on such aspects as a history of the ongoing program, problems resolved, problems not evident but unresolved (i.e. food supplies, menus, staff relationships), and accounts of existing problems that were evident and unresolved. The interview was a functional means of bringing forth the developmental experiences of the total staff at the Child Development Centers.

---

*All instruments included in the appendix.

The limitations of the interview as a research technique were taken into account. The interview, both in its process and in recording, may cull the prejudices of both interviewee and interviewer. The self-protective mechanisms of both participants tend to delimit the areas of response. The worth of the interview is highly dependent upon the interviewing skill of the evaluator and his ability to establish rapport, reduce anxiety and record accurately. Recording may highly bias the analysis of the interview data if there is only recording of selected perceptions on the part of the interviewer. The validity of the interview data is then based upon the interviewers knowledge ability of research procedure, the skills of the worker in eliciting information requested by the instrument, and a good concept of time and diligence in objectively evaluating what may reasonably be recorded.

The strengths in the interview method lay in the fact that the evaluators again defined the functions and areas of investigation based upon their own experiences of being evaluated and interviewed. It provided a preparation for the group for the interviewing task, relieving their anxiety and providing ways of soliciting cooperation from the interviewee. The interview form also gave latitude in providing an area for the rephrasing of questions and follow-up related to responses received. To limit any distortion of recall, the evaluator was instructed to record in process and fill immediately after the interview.

Interviews were administered to head teachers in each center in the sample and to two of the group teachers that were randomly selected by the evaluator at the first visit. The family assistant* was also interviewed as a vital link between the school and community.

*Note error on form: read Family Worker instead of Family Assistant

Where time did not permit, the questionnaire was used as a good alternative for the preferred interview. The use of the questionnaire for the assistant teachers emerged as an outgrowth of the feeling of the evaluation team that a valuable source of information on the functioning of the centers was vested in this corps of workers who had little at stake in expressing honest impressions about their feelings and observations of the Center and its personnel. Due to the lack of professional knowledge ability on the part of the assistant teachers, certain protections were built into the questionnaire form to guard against this instrument being used as a vehicle for the expression of ignorance, misinformation and/or feelings of inadequacy projected to other members of the center staff. Assistant teachers were requested to identify the needs of the youngsters as they perceived them, along with a description of the ways in which the classroom program was meeting these needs. The answers to these two questions offered a framework within which to identify the meaningful contributions in the rest of the form.

Chapter III

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

Staffing:

All the professional personnel of the Child Development Centers included in the sample population expressed strong positive feelings related to the contribution of the summer programs to the lives of the participant children. In this respect, there were no conflicting appraisals. Similarly, the members of the evaluation team perceived many positive values of the Center's experiences for the children. They expressed the professional conviction that the majority of children were benefiting from the summer's experiences. The explicit values perceived will be described in section three of this chapter dealing with the educational programs in the classrooms. The subsequent statements and analyses of the findings describe in detail the degree to which the staffing of the summer program enhanced the stated goals, and the degree to which difficulties and limitations were perceived and identified.

In each of the following areas, the data is to be analyzed in terms of three major frameworks: (1) the correlation between the structure as proposed and the on-going practices in the centers, (2) the perceived strengths and weaknesses of each part of the operational structure, and (3) recommendations.

Head Teacher:

The proposal called for one head-teacher to coordinate the educational program at each center. Her responsibility included the supervision and coordination of (a) recruitment of children by family-community staff, (b) maintenance, (c) classroom programs and teaching staff, and (d) auxiliary services: i.e., the role of this professional person was to insure a smoothly running center with all center personnel working cooperatively, in their respective roles, toward the goal of providing healthy programs for young children. The degree to which this role was fulfilled by the selected head teachers varied greatly from center to center. Two reasons accounting for this differential identified by both the head teachers and the evaluating team were:

1) limited experience in administration and teaching of young children, and
2) personal suitability to the administrative role.

Table I describes the number of years experience on the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten level for each professional teacher in the sample population. Experience on the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten level ranges from no experience to thirty years. Total early childhood and elementary teaching experience ranges from one year to thirty-five years.*

Several schools in the sample population faced the problem of personality conflicts within the staff group which seriously impeded the cooperation of center personnel. In two of these instances, this conflict apparently related to the youth and inexperience of the head teacher.

The most common area of conflict was between the professionals and non-professionals. The head teacher, in the role of leader of the professionals, carried the greatest burden, received the major criticism, and felt the greatest frustration in terms of lack of effectiveness in resolving the conflicts within the time allowed. It is important to note that the head teacher assignment placed this person in the most delicate relationship role of the total program. This individual (in 2/3 of the center evaluated) was called upon to supervise and guide group teachers who were her fellow teachers in the past school year and would be again in the coming year. For the summer only, she was placed in an administrative position which required the execution of authority acts in the role of supervisor. Additionally, the cluster supervisor (from the Bureau of Early Childhood Education) of whom she was to solicit help and guidance, was frequently her immediate supervisor in the regular school program wherein she carried no administrative authority. The assumption of an administrative position for a few weeks, with the knowledge of the imminent return to the teaching level, can seriously impede the kind of authority that will be exercised and the initiative and creativity applied

---

*It is important to note that no assumption was made that the greater the teaching experience the more successful the role of head teacher. There is some indication that extremes on this scale represent the most difficult challenges. The essentially inexperienced teacher lack the self-assurance necessary to successfully guide the other professionals and non-professionals. Similarly, the teacher of many years standing faced the challenge of stepping into an administrative role for a brief eight weeks.

to the task.

The types of administrative problems that head teachers met are described in Section Two of this chapter dealing with the administrative structure. Some examples are briefly listed below:

- Late secretarial assignment: leaving a center without secretarial help for several weeks. The head teacher, therefore assumed the additional responsibility of keeping office records, filling out payroll forms, answering the phone, etc.
- Late delivery of a variety of supplies: food, snack, expendable materials, equipment etc. The administrator faced the task of attempting to unsnarl a mix-up in the records at the central office in order to receive the needed and allocated supplies, as well as helping teachers to amend programs to accommodate for vital missing materials.
- Lack of appropriate coordination between the custodian of the school and the summer center staff; leading to problems in maintenance. As a rule, head teachers were not given a key to the building and were therefore dependent upon the time schedule of the custodian.
- No auxiliary professional services (excluding medical) for all or part of the summer: i.e. psychologist, social worker and/or psychiatrist.
- Late arrival of family funds: limiting the development of the family-community activities as defined.
- No Spanish speaking staff member in Spanish speaking communities.
- Poor relationship with regular school staff: leading to problems in recruitment, housing and equipment.

The head teachers varied in their ability to deal with the frustrations that were a part of this administrative role. A few responded to the challenge by devoting the major portion of their energies to the clerical work. Others demonstrated the perseverance to continually fight through the "red-tape" of a large organizational structure to achieve their goals. Still others focused their energies on the classrooms and ignored the rest of the administrative challenge.

The team of evaluators generally found about half of the head teachers in the sample functioning on a better than average level. The rest distributed on a range from average to poor except for a few who were judgedexcellent. Some, with more than a reasonable number of operational obstacles were able to work with the teaching staff in order to assure a worthwhile program for the children. Most of the head teachers were able to diminish the organizational problems. Where the major problem was the quality of teaching performance on the part of any one or a group of teachers, the problems were frequently as intense at the end of the summer as at the outset. Little change could be expected in the teaching pattern of any professional under the circumstances of this eight week program. One head teacher faced with such a problem expressed her conviction that there should be a probationary period for all personnel in the summer program. It was her opinion that it is better for a group of children th change their teacher, as difficult as this might be, rather than to expose them to a negative experience as their "Head-Start" in school.

Recommendations:

Since there was little in the way of previous experience in administration to guide the Board of Education in the selection of personnel for this critical administrative role, it seems imperative that some direction be taken from the experiences gained this summer. Poor head teachers should not be reselected. However, some assessment of the difficulties of fulfilling this role as structured needs to be done relative to the realities of relationships in the summer hierarchy compared to the school year hierarchy. Do the values of being in the 'home school' outweigh the obstacles presented in fulfilling the administrative role, or is the reverse true? Can this person adequately exercise her authority in an imaginative and creative way when supervised by her school year "assistant principal"?

This area needs carefule examination. The appropriate selection and assignment of this critical person has strong impact on the future success or failure of these summer programs.

Group Teachers:

The role of the group teacher is to organize, direct and supervise the educational program in her assigned classroom. This task includes the on-going guidance of all additional teaching personnel assigned to the group; the assistant teacher, the aide, and the volunteers. As noted in the evaluation of the educational program (Section Three of this chapter), most teachers expressed the feeling that the success of their summer teaching program rested in the structure of small class groups and the high adult child ratio. However, a large number of the teachers described varying measures of difficulty in working with the non-professionals in the teaching situation. This difficulty was traced to four factors:

1) the lack of outside class time for meetings with the non-professional teaching personnel,
2) the lack of adequate preparation; limited knowledge of young children and poor teaching skills,
3) the group teacher's inexperience in working with auxiliary teaching help in the classroom, and
4) the group teacher's inexperience on the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten level.

The teachers expressed feelings that some members of this corps of helpers were not suited to working with young children. It is difficult to assess, from the perspective of observational evaluation the extent to which the assistants' lack of appropriate behavior with young children was due to inadequate knowledge, skills and guidance or to poor personality adaptability to the teaching task.

While the major portion of the group teachers offered as much guidance as they could and assigned to them both teaching and non-teaching responsibilities, some teachers reacted to this unskilled group, at the low extreme with hostility and/or disregard of their presence in the classroom.

Many teachers in the summer program were also faced with the challenge of adapting their teaching pattern to an age level with which they had never worked. As shown in Table I, 37 of the 70 teachers in the sample population, had less than one year's experience working with kindergarten or pre-kindergarten children. The identification of the needs of this age group in terms of appropriate developmental experience and guidance absorbed much of the energies of the teachers. For this group, with little or no experience, the added task of guiding inexperienced non-professional personnel was difficult.

Despite these difficulties, in the majority of situations the members of the evaluating team described positive changes in the guidance of the children and quality of classroom experiences from the first to the second visit.

Recommendation:

There seems to be a need for the selection of more appropriately experienced group teachers.

Assistant Teachers:

The allocation of one assistant teacher per group selected from the current college population raised several questions. However, there was general agreement of the need for assistant teachers.

The body of assistant teachers in the sample population represented all types of college majors, and were students who had generally completed two years of undergraduate study. Many had no experience with young children and had no academic background in education or the applied social science fields. The professional teaching staff at the centers indicated a strong disapproval of such unskilled assistant teachers. They also expressed the feeling that the task of adequate guidance of this unskilled and unknowledgable group was not reasonable within the time allowed. It permitted little rewards for the children and the program.

Reponses by the assistant teachers to the questionnaires offered substantial support to this judgement. Approximately one third of the sample evidenced the kind of misunderstanding of the children and the program that could be described as gross. I.E. "Teachers should have taught the children to read and write."

In those instances where the assistant teacher (a) manifested a natural ability to relate warmly and positively to young children, or (b) rapidly learned from the group teacher without the need for extensive guidance or (c) had previously developed some of the basic skills of guiding and relating to young children, they were considered a strong, positive, even "invaluable" factor in the achievement of the summer's goals.

The male assistant teachers were especially valued as indicated by teacher responses and observed children's behavior. The professional teaching staff who had successful experiences with the male assistants stated the "there should be one male adult assigned to each classroom in the future". Male assistant teachers who were rated below the acceptable level by the members of the evaluating team were observed as eagerly sought out by the children.

Recommendations:

There is a need for some finer methods of selection for this body of classroom helpers. Teachers need the help of those persons who will contribute to the lives of the children without disrupting the on-going educational programs. The recommendations for orientation and on-going guidance are discussed under section 2 of this chapter.

Aides:

The general feelings of the professional teaching staff were positive toward this corps of assistants. The responses ranged from highly enthusiastic and appreciative of their contribution to grudging tolerance of their presence. The most common positive responses reflected feelings that the aides had a natural feeling for the youngsters and related to them in a warm, confortable and supportive manner, thereby fulfilling a needed classroom role. The extreme negative responses were similar in nature to those concerning the assistant teacher: the task of guiding two non-professionals and developing and administering a healthy program for the children was too great to be accomplished successfully in eight weeks.

The male aides were as valued as the male assistant teachers.

SECTION II

Center Structures as Designed and Administered by the Board of Education of the City of New York

It is in the nature of a large educational endeavor that each person working within the structure develops a series of firm convictions concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The sample population of this evaluation included 105 professionals, 70 non-professional assistant teachers, and 35-50 family assistants--over 200 persons who were working daily within the situation being evaluated. As described in Chapter II on Instrumentation, the evaluating team sought to elicit as many pertinent reactions as possible concerning the functioning of these centers in order to give meaning and purpose to the findings for future planning.

Persons working hard toward a goal tend to be highly involved in thought about those aspects which frustrate them in their realization of achievement. In summarizing the findings of the evaluation in this area, an effort was made to organize the responses into unit areas. Single responses describing a problem were not included unless they fit into a general pattern or were considered particularly sensitive perceptions.

The major portion of this section will be devoted to the description and identification of problems in the over-all operation of the Child Development Centers.

Staffing: Selection and Orientation

Approximately one half of the interviewed professionals expressed concern in the area of selection of personnel and orientation of the total center staff. As described in Section One of this chapter, the selection of the non-professional personnel elicited the greatest number of negative responses. Occasionally head teachers questioned the selection of the group teachers. In several instances, the members of the evaluating team questioned the selection of the head teachers and the group teachers.

From the point of view of objective criteria, it is necessary to note that 8 of the 35 head teachers in the sample population had no more than one year's experience teaching young children of the age served by the centers: 3 had no experience and 5 had one year of experience (See Table I). This represents almost one fourth of the sample population of this specified group.

Of the group teachers, 33 of the 70 had no experience teaching this age group, and 15 of the remaining 37 had experience of one year or less. Thus, 48 group teachers of the population of 70 (approximately 2/3) were highly inexperienced with the pre-kindergarten and kindergarten curriculum and child. In the instance of one school (#3 code), the head teacher's full teaching experience consisted of four years on the elementary level, and the rest of her staff were totally inexperienced on all levels. The burden, under these conditions, seems awesome.

Considering the limited early childhood education experience for this high a percentage of the professional personnel, the significance of the fact that the professionals expressed concern over their responsibility for guiding the non-professionals becomes clear. It also places the negative comments concerning selection and orientation within a more appropriate

TABLE I

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING PERSONNEL: EXPERIENCE AND REGULAR SCHOOL ASSIGNMENT

Code # of Center	No. of Year's Experience and Grades (Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten)						Grade Assignment during School Year			"Home" School Regular Sch. Yr.			Head Start Experience '65		
	Head Teacher		Teacher 1		Teacher 2										
	PK-K	Grades	PK-K	Grades	PK-K	Grades	HT	T^1	T^2	HT	T^1	T^2	HT	T^1	T^2
1	8	0	1½	1½	6 mos.	0	1*	K	K	D	S	S	+	0	0
2	4	0	0	4	0	1 ✓	K	(2) 1*	1*	S	S	D	+	0	0
3	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	3*	K*	S	D	D	0	(AT) +	0
4	9	0	6	8	0	2½	K	1	1	S	S	S	+	0	0
5	0 ✓	5 ✓	1	2	9	6 mos.	Guidance	P-K	P-K	S	S	S	0	+	0
6	9	0	1	1	0	1	P-K*	P-K	2*	S	S	S	0	0	0
7	7	7	0	1	0	1	K	1	1	D	S	S	+	0	+
8	6	0	0	1	9½	6	K	1	K	S	S	S	0	+	+
9	3	1	0	1	0	6	K	K	4	S	S	D	+	0	+
10	8	2	6	0	0	0	1	P-K	K	S	S	S	0	+	0
11	4	½	0	3	6 mos.	0	K	2	-	S	D	D	+	0	0
12	20	1	20	1	5	2	K	K	2	D	D	D	0	+	0
13	25	2	2½	0	0	2	K	K	2	S	S	S	+	+	0
14	10	1	10	3	0	8	K	1	4	S	S	S	+	+	0
15	14	3	12	2	3	1½	K	K	1*	S	S	D	0	+	0
16	3½	0	0	2½	DNC 1½	DNC 1	K	K	1	S	S	S	+	0	0
17	4	0	4	0	0	3	P-K	K	1-2 MES	S	S	S	+	+	0

(continued next page)

TABLE I (continued)

Code # of Center	No. of Year's Experience and Grades (Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten)						Grade Assignment during School Year			"Home" School Regular Sch. Yr.			Head Start Experience '65		
	Head Teacher		Teacher 1		Teacher 2										
	PK-K	Grades	PK-K	Grades	PK-K	Grades	HT	T^1	T^2	HT	T^1	T^2	HT	T^1	T^2
18	1	7	0	2	0	3½	✓	6	1	S	S	D	+	0	0
19	DNC 1	0	1	0	1	0	P-K	K	P-K	D	S	D	+	0	+
20	30	5	2	0	6 mos.	0	K	K	Not Assign.	S	D	D	+	+	0
21	18	2	1	7	0	3	P-K	K	✓	S	S	S	+	0	0
22	10	0	0	5	1	0	K	1	K	S	D	D	+	0	+
23	5½	0	0	6 mos.	2	0	K	1	K	S	S	S	+	0	0
24	1	2	8	4	0	0	K	1	2	S	D	S	0	+	0
25	12	8	1	0	1 Sub.	0	1-2 MES	P-K*	Not Assign.	S	D	-	0	0	0
26	15	4	0	6 mos.	7	0	K	2	K	D	D	S	+	+	0
28	15	0	2½	2	0	4½	P-K	3	✓	S	D	S	+	0	+
29	1	20	15	3	1	0	1	1	P-K	S	D	S	+	0	0
30	1	1	0	5	0	2	K	1	K*	D	S	S	+	0	0
31	3	1	0	6	0	3	P-K	2	1	S	S	S	0	0	0
32	3	0	0	2	0	4	K	P-K	1	S	S	D	+	+	0
33	2	1	8	7	0	0	K	K	K*	S	D	D	0	0	0
34	2	0	0	3	1	0	K	2	1*	D	S	D	+	0	0
35	5	1	1	0	14	6	K	K	P-K	S	S	S	+	0	+

Key:
✓ : OTP (Other than teaching personnel)
* : Coming year assignment: not previous year assignment
S : Same school
D : Different school
AT : Assistant teacher
+ : Yes
0 : No
DNC : Data not clear
MES : More effective school

perspective. Inexperienced teachers would find the task of guiding other non-experienced personnel a difficult challenge, and would be prone to look for more competent help in the classroom. Although a few teachers expressed the opinion that two regular teachers in the room would be more suitable than the current summer plan, there is strong indication from the major body of the responses that this alternative is not an appropriate one to consider at this time.

There seems to be a need to reevaluate and restructure procedures for orientation and on-going staff guidance before a judgement can be made referrent to the success of the current staffing plan. The strong, positively expressed values of having a high adult-child ratio directs attention to the question of how to effectively coordinate the work of the classroom personnel.

The orientation of all center personnel was referred to as a problem by a majority of those interviewed. For some, this was a highly emotional issue, provoking an unusual amount of anger and hostility. The conclusion to be drawn concerning orientation is that some restructuring of the current procedure is essential. Teachers reflected negative feelings pertaining to a) being required to attend orientation sessions, (b) the content of the orientation sessions, and (c) poor timing of orientation sessions coordinated with their on-going teaching schedules. Positive responses, considerably less in number, reflected a feeling that the orientation sessions were meaningful and contributed to the success of the summer's teaching experience.

In substance, the suggestions for change focus on the following:

(1) Providing an opportunity for center personnel to participate as a group in planning for the summer program. The interview responses indicated that there was considerable confusion on the part of many members of the center staff concerning individual role and responsibility. This confusion led to misunderstandings and extensive loss of effectiveness and cooperation. In some cases, there was a gross lack of information

available to staff concerning the tools that would be provided and what the individual task was to be.

Plans need to be made for the center staff to gain appropriate understanding of their respective roles and to have an opportunity to jointly plan the execution of their jobs before the onset of the program.

Although the personnel were on the center premises for two days before the formal program began, these two days were utilized primarily for the setting up of the rooms and the enrollment of the children. It was reported that the staff had little opportunity to meet together for uninterrupted periods. It was further indicated that this group needed the guidance of an experienced educator to direct the effectiveness of preliminary planning meetings at the centers.

(2) Providing an opportunity for group teachers to develop their skills and understandings beyond their present level. It seems desirable that some separation of experience level groups may be made in that part of the orientation program that deals with curriculum development in the classroom.

(3) Providing center staff the physical time to benefit from the orientation program. All such programs ran concurrent with the regular end of the school year program. Teachers attended these sessions in the evenings, after a day's teaching and on Saturdays after a week's work. Many of them reflected on their exhaustion during this period, irrespective of content or appropriateness of the programs.

Family assistants participated in an orientation program after the onset of the summer's activities. This timing was referred to as extremely poor by those involved.

Relative to the problems of on-going guidance of center personnel, one of the biggest problems (in addition to inexperience) seems to have been the lack of time. Although the structure of the centers included a weekly after-school conference of professional personnel and some auxiliary staff, no plan was made to include the non-professional teaching staff. Teachers reported that they were unable to find time outside the teaching schedule to meet with their assistant teachers, aides and volunteers. Since the assistant teachers were part time employees, the only time their schedules overlapped was mid-day when the children were in attendance.

B. Facilities: Housing, Equipment and Supplies

The proposal for the facilities of the summer program relied heavily upon a cooperative relationship between the regular school personnel and the summer staff. In reality, there was a serious lack of articulation between the two programs.

Housing: Regular school administrative personnel were requested to allocate an assigned number of the most appropriate classrooms for use in the summer program. In those few cases where grade rooms were assigned instead of kindergarten rooms, the problems surrounding adequate space and equipment appeared serious.

Maintenance: ** In approximately one third of the centers in the sample population, maintenance problems that directly affected the educational programs were identified. Some neglect was noted in classroom maintenance, garbage disposal, maintenance of auxiliary rooms and of the outdoor play areas.

One head teacher reported that the building maintenance staff claimed to have no additional allocation for care of the building during the summer and therefore they could not fulfill their function in the building. The professional staff, in this case, contributed monies toward the purchase of cleaning materials.

Some investigation needs to be made relative to planning for and execution of this vital role. Future plans should take this problem into account and protect against its recurrence.

** In the design of the instruments, no data on maintenance was specifically requested. Due to the relevance of this procedure, some of the observers and professional staff elected to report problems in this area. However, our data is incomplete since it relied upon the awareness and concern of the evaluator to make notations.

Equipment:

The proposal for equipping the summer program comprised a plan by which school-year personnel were to make available the major portion of their basic equipment for use in the summer. This equipment was to include blocks and accessories, dramatic play materials, science materials, language art materials, manipulative materials, non-expendable arts and crafts materials, etc. The degree to which the regular teachers cooperated with this directive varied greatly. The trend was markedly toward the storing of equipment and materials vs. leaving them accessible for use. 44 of the 70 teachers were not in their regular school year classrooms and therefore had to contend with this limitation of basic materials. (See Table I). Of this group of 44, 25 were not in their home schools and thus did not have access to materials stored in their own rooms.

In the majority of centers, the block accessories, housekeeping, dramatic play, woodworking, science and language development materials were evaluated as less than adequate for the class group (see Table II). 14 of the centers in the sample population were unable to use any outdoor facilities at the school. Of the twenty remaining, only 8 were evaluated as adequate. Generally, public parks were not reported to be satisfactory alternatives.

It is not the task of this evaluation to begin to assess the many reasons why teachers chose to store the larger percentage of their basic classroom equipment rather than leave it available for the summer program. However, there is a recommendation here to begin to assess the practical results of such a plan in terms of the equipment available to the youngsters during the summer.

A variety of alternatives are available and should be explored. Suggestions from the teachers and head teachers followed a general trend of

TABLE II

HOUSING, EQUIPMENT & SUPPLIES *

General Equipment	Unavailable	Available	Adequate
Blocks and Construction	1	13	20
Block accessories	3	17	14
Housekeeping materials.........	0	19	15
Dramatic play materials........	2	19	13
Water play materials...........	10	10	14
Manipulative materials.........	1	15	18
Woodworking materials..........	17	9	8
Science tools and materials....	13	15	6
Language development materials.	0	20	14
Games	3	16	15
Books	0	19	15
Puppets	7	15	12
Arts and Crafts materials......	0	13	21
Music:			
Instruments..........	7	8	19
Phonograph	3	10	21
Piano	1	9	23
Outdoor equipment:			
Climbing	23	4	7
Construction	27	6	1
Sand box and tools...	27	4	3
Water play	28	5	1
Wheel toys	27	5	2
Balls, ropes, etc. ..	14	8	12
School Playground	14	12	8
Local Park	15	17	2

*Footnote: Data available for 34 schools of the 35 in the sample.

requesting that (a) there be time for cooperative planning between the two teachers using the same room, and (b) the summer teacher have the option of ordering materials and equipment that would most effectively add to the existing equipment available. In this way, both the summer and winter program would benefit from the additional expenditures.

Materials and Supplies:

Basic arts and crafts supplies plus some auxiliary materials in language arts, science, manipulative and dramatic play were on the master list of supplies and materials to be given to each center classroom. The problems surrounding this structure for supplying the summer classrooms focused in two areas: (1) delivery date of listed items and (2) selections on the master list.

(1) The delivery date of supplies, especially in the arts and crafts area varied considerably. The trend most notable was late delivery, ranging from 2 to 8 weeks late. In an eight week program, this poses a serious obstacle to the teaching personnel for program development. In those centers where teachers were in their own classrooms (26 to 70), or even in their home schools (19 more of the 70) they were able to utilize the school year supplies to cover this interim period between onset of the program and arrival of supplies. (Table I)

(2) Selections on the master list evoked mixed responses. Two patterns of negative responses were identified: (a) the concept of duplication (b) professional disagreement concerning the quality of selections, especially the books.

(a) Duplication: The professionals working the centers expressed their convictions that the process of supplying the centers with materials was inefficient.

At one extreme was the concern for the duplications of materials available in the classroom; and also the duplication of materials given to each classroom in a given center, thereby making two to four sets of identical materials allocated to a center. As indicated above, the master list included books, puzzles, puppets and science materials as well as the expendable arts and crafts supplies. Teachers described situations wherein the puzzles, books and puppets were duplicates of those already available. They would have preferred to have the opportunity to plan ahead with the regular classroom teacher for ordering an expanded selection. In the opinion of the teachers, those classrooms where the group teacher would be working in her own classroom over the summer, the task seemed to lend itself to an easy accommodation to this recommendation.

In addition to this specified area of duplication, teachers reflected upon the waste of having several sets of identical books, science materials etc., given to a center. Since the book list was considered minimal, they felt that a center with four classes could have benefited from having four different sets of books delivered. This would have offered an opportunity for exchange and expanded selection of story reading experiences for the youngsters. Puzzles, puppets and other materials could also have been distributed in this manner.

(b) Selections on the master list: There was a trend of negative reactions that described inappropriateness of book selection for the developmental and experiential needs of the participant children. Teachers commented that there was only one book that showed pictures of members of a minority group, and few books that could be used to expand the concepts being developed in the trips. Once again, the directive seems to be toward having the teaching staff at the centers participate in the selection of the materials to be used. As one teacher expressed it, "Only the classroom teacher REALLY knows what her children need."

Auxiliary professional services:

As illustrated in Table III, the availability of auxiliary services of the psychologist, social worker and psychiatrist were highly inconsistent. Although the medical staff fits within this category, no center reported any difficulty at all with this service. It was considered highly satisfactory. Consequently, further discussion in this area will be restricted to the three professional representatives identifed above.

Of the 35 schools in the sample, 9 reported full service available and 7 reported no auxiliary service available. The detailed breakdown in partial service of the 19 remaining showed 9 had no psychologist, 7 had no social worker and 11 had no psychiatrist.

The reasons for this high variability in the offering of auxiliary professional services to the centers was not sought in this evaluational procedure. The center personnel reflected negative responses in relation to this inconsistent pattern. From the perspective of the evaluation team, this total area needs serious reconsideration for the future. Of the centers which had these services fully available, some utilized them fruitfully, and some barely utilized them at all. Some of these professionals were on call, but did not appear unless requested. In the judgment of the evaluators, the head

Summary of TABLE III

AVAILABILITY and EVALUATION of AUXILIARY PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

FULL Auxiliary Service Available - 9 Schools
NO " " " - 7 Schools

Aux. Services Avail.	Psychologist	Social Worker	Psychiatrist
# of schools available	19	22	18
# of schools unavailable	16	13	17
Total	35	35	35

# Ratings			
Excellent	2	1	0
Good	8	7	2
Acceptable	5	6	6
Poor	1	3	3
Not used	1	2	2
Not rated	2	0	4
Not enough	0	3	1
Total	19	22	18

TABLE III

AVAILABILITY and EVALUATION of AUXILIARY PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

Aux. Prof. Personnel →	Psychologist		Social Worker		Psychiatrist	
Availability & Rating	Availability	Evaluation	Avail.	Eval.	Avail.	Eval.
↓ School Code # ↓						
1	--	--	--	--	Upon request	OK
2	1 day/week	OK	--	--	--	--
3	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	½ day/alternate week	OK	1 day/wk.	Good	Upon request	Not used
5	Began 6th wk.	?	--	--	--	--
6	2 days/wk.	Good	1 day/wk.	Good	1½ days/Summer	OK
7	--	--	1 day/wk.?	Poor	2x/Summer	Poor
8	Upon request	Not used	Upon req.	Not used	1½ days/wk.	OK
9	--	--	1 day/wk.	OK	--	--
10	Upon request	OK	Upon req.	OK	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	3x/Summer	Poor
12	Avail.?	Good	Avail.?	Poor	Upon req.	Not used
13	--	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	--	--	--	--
15	2x/wk.	?	--	--	2x/Summer	?
16	1 day/wk.	Poor	Avail.?	Good	Avail.?	Good
17	Avail.?	OK	--	--	--	--
18	--	--	Avail.?	Good	1 day/Summer	Needed more
19	1½-2 days/wk.	Good	Avail.?	Poor	Aug. only	?
20	Avail.?	Good	1 day/wk	Good	Avail.?	?
21	--	--	Avail.?	Good	Avail.?	Good
22	Avail.?	Good	1 day/wk.	Not enough	--	--
23	2 days/wk.	Good	1 day/wk.	Not enough	3x/Summer	OK
24	--	--	--	--	--	--
25	1 day/wk.	Excellent	1 day/wk.	Exc.	--	--
26	2 days/wk.	Excellent	1 day/wk.	OK	3x/Summer	OK
27	--	--	--	--	Upon req.	OK
28	--	--	1 day/wk.	Not enough	2x/Summer	Poor
29	2 days/wk.	Good	1 day/wk.	OK	--	--
30	--	--	--	--	--	--
31	--	--	--	--	--	--
32	--	--	2 days/wk.	OK	--	--
33	2 days/wk.	OK	1 day/wk.	OK	1 day/Summer	?
34	--	--	--	--	--	--
35	1 day/wk.	Good	1 day/wk.	Good	--	--

teachers frequently lacked the skill, initiative, security or organization to call on these services appropriately. Since few head teachers had previous experience in administration, it was difficult for them to understand how and when to direct the auxiliary personnel.

The social worker was the only professional link to the families. In a program such as this, which directs its attention to the concept of community-school cooperation in an educational endeavor, the lack of a qualified professional to fulfill this role in one third of the sample population appears to be a serious violation of the over-all program proposal.

Several centers reported that the professional personnel assigned to them on a regularly scheduled basis did not adhere to the schedule. The head teacher was frequently in the position of not knowing when they were coming to visit. There was also a feeling among the evaluating team that the qualitative judgments made by the head teacher did not reflect an honest appraisal of the summer's experience. Contradictions were picked up in the processing of the data leading to a suspicion that these head teachers were hesitant to make negative comments concerning the consultant services. In one instance, the head teacher reported that the social worker came one day a week, and the service was satisfactory. At a later point, she mentioned that she had not seen the social worker in three weeks and could not predict the next visit. In the estimate of this evaluating team any description of this service which is not stated in positive terms (good or excellent) indicates a poor level of cooperative participation between center and consultant.

If it is judged that the Child Development Centers need the auxiliary professional services, then some reorganization of the structure and administration of this part of the program is deemed essential. Consistent assignments should be made. Further, all professionals involved need an opportunity to work out the kind of role and responsibility pattern that will enhance the educational programs for the children and the participant families.

Funding:

The Child Development Centers faced a serious problem as a result of late payments by the Board of Education. This tardiness in sending out monies affected the educational programs of the centers in two ways: (1) delays in undertaking the described parts of the program, and (2) demoralization of staff, and financial hardship for some personnel.

The monies allocated to the parent programs which were to be directed by the family assistants did not reach the centers until the fifth week of the eight week program. Family assistants understood that they were to make no expenditures until the money was received. After it was received, reportedly, they understood that they were to spend it all within the remaining two and one half weeks. Whether these directives were, in truth, given to the Centers is not as important as the fact that all Family Assistants interview so interpreted it. Staff at some centers, who were in a financial position to do so, paid in advance for many of the parent activities conducted in the early weeks on that assumption that the budgeted money would arrive. Other centers did not do this. One Head Teacher expressed it this way: "The tardy funding crippled our parent program".

Staff salaries were also made late enough to warrant a series of negative responses. On several occasions the members of the evaluating team were greeted at the centers with the question, "Did you bring our money?"

Some head teachers expressed the feeling that the demoralization acruing from this late payment of salaries could not help but affect the quality of teaching in the classrooms.

Lunch Program:

Two facets of the lunch program were discussed by the Center Personnel: (1) quality, selection and amount of food, and (2) scheduling of supervision.

(1) The responses regarding the quality, selection and amount of food generally fell at two extremes. Either the lunches were described as inappropriate for the population served, or they were an asset in exposing children to a more varied diet. Either the food was tasteless and unappetizing, or it was tasteful and the children enjoyed it. Either there was too much food which led to "shameful waste", or there was not enough for the children to have a "decent" portion.

On the few occasions where members of the evaluational team had the opportunity to observe the lunch program, the same divergent observations were reflected.

Under the circumstances, it would seem that this area needs to be explored more carefully for the future. It might be that centers serving different minority groups need different menus. Centers should have the opportunity to offer early feedback to the central agency supplying the food to allow for appropriate adjustments.

(2) The proposal called for the supervision of the lunch program by the assistant teachers and the aides. Where the assistants and aides were not adequately skilled with children, the teachers felt that this was poor planning. The lunch program was considered a vital part of the educational experience and therefore should have had a skilled professional participating in the activity with the children. Perhaps some flexibility in scheduling would be appropriate in the future, so that teachers who deem it necessary are able to participate in the lunch program. Some teachers reported that they did so, but others said they could not because of a shortage of food.

Enrollment and Attrition:

In a gross analysis, the enrollment of children in the centers does not reflect any serious problem. Table IV illustrates that 25 of the 35 centers in the sample were over-enrolled. 8 of the 10 remaining had a 90% or better enrollment. The two schools listed as 80% enrollment were ones that were over-enrolled as the program began. With the transfer of a group teacher to each center, the roster was increased by 30.

The attrition rate for all centers in the sample was low. Attendance patterns offered no major questions or concerns.

In a finer analysis, however, there appears some questions regarding enrollment that will ultimately demand explanation. The original proposal described a program to meet the needs of children who are scheduled to enter school for the first time in the fall of the year. Three of the centers show an enrollment of 50% or over of children who have had previous school experience. Twelve more schools have from 20-50% reregistered children.

Inquiry into this discrepancy revealed two kinds of explanations:
(1) lack of cooperation from the regular school staff left the summer staff with no list of candidates to seek for enrollment. They were dependent upon the publicity that brought parents to the centers. In some school areas, this publicity was reported to be non-existent as far as the activities of the local public school were concerned. Consequently, once the program had begun, they enrolled all children meeting age and financial standards whose parents requested entrance.

(2) A high number of private and public head start programs were reported to be in some areas, thereby creating competition for the potential enrollees. Once again, when the program began, the centers registered any child who was brought (meeting age and financial standards).

TABLE IV

CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS:
Enrollment, Attrition, Attendance, Availability of Volunteers and Population Served

Code # of School	Enrollment		Attrition of Drop-outs	Registered Children		Average Daily Attendance #/Registration	Assignment of Groups by Age	Volunteers Available in Center	Population Served
	Actual # / Capacity	% of Capacity		% of Actual Enrollment	#				
1	70/60	117%	5	12%	9	52/70	Mixed	None	93% White 7% Puerto Rican
2	122/120	102%	10	20%	24	88/122	By age	None	49% Negro 49% P.R. 2% Other
3	125/120	104%	1	4%	6	100/125	Mixed	None	60% P.R. 39% Negro 1% Other
4	85/90*	94% **	15	7%	6	77/85	By age	4	70% Negro 30% P.R.
5	109/120	91%	8	10%	11	86/109	Mixed	4	95% P.R. 3% Negro 2% White
6	117/120	98%	4	10%	12	95/117	Mixed	6	99% Negro 1% White
7	101/90 X	112% **	10	22%	22	75/101	Mixed	None	100% Negro
8	154/150 *	115% **	6	26%	41	138/154	By age	5	70% Negro 29% P.R. 1% Other
9	122/120	102%	4	19%	24	108/122	By age	1 Part-time	90% Negro 10% P.R.
10	120/120	100%	6	3%	5	100/120	Mixed	None	50% Negro 50% P.R.
11	139/120	113%	5	D.N.A.	D.N.A.	115/139	Mixed	1	50% Negro 50% P.R.
12	75/60	112%	1	8%	6	70/75	Mixed	2 Part-time	100% Negro
13	129/120	107%	6	9%	12	103/129	Mixed	1	95% Negro 5% Other
14	134/120	112%	6	20%	24	100/134	Mixed	None	92% Negro 8% P.R.
15	131/120	110%	7	25%	32	106/131	Mixed	None	100% Negro

(continued next page)

TABLE IV (continued)

Code # of School	Enrollment		Attrition of Drop-outs	Registered Children		Average Daily Attendance #/Registration	Assignment of Groups by Age	Volunteers Available in Center	Population Served
	Actual # / Capacity	% of Capacity		% of Actual Enrollment	#				
16	72/90 *	80% **	2	—	0	60/72	Mixed	2	80% Negro 20% P.R.
17	72/90 *	80% **	20	5%	4	Poor-D.N.A.	Mixed	None	65% P.R. 35% Negro
18	131/120	109%	16	39%	52	125/131	Mixed	None	75% P.R. 20% Negro 5% Other
192	120/120	100%	4	2%	3	95/120	Mixed	None	75% White 20% Negro 5% P.R.
20	110/120	91%	6	6%	7	80/110 Z	Mixed	9	95% Negro 5% Spanish
21	128/120	107%	8	90%	115	110/128	By age	None	60% P.R. 40% Negro
22	122/120	102%	10	25%	31	110/122	Mixed	3	60% P.R. 40% Negro
23	122/120	102%	5	—	0	105/122	Mixed	None	90% P.R. 8% Negro 2% Other
24	144/120	122%	13	20%	28	128/144	Mixed	4	58% Negro 40% P.R. 2% Other
25	63/60	105%	0	9%	5	55/63	Mixed	2	50% Negro 50% P.R.
26	114/120	95%	0	25%	28	D.N.A.	Mixed	None	80% Negro 20% P.R.
27	147/120	125%	6	10%	13	120/147	By age	1	45% Negro 45% P.R. 10% Other
28	119/120	99%	3	50%	60	100/119	By age	None	100% Negro
29	120/120	100%	10	50%	60	102/120	By age	1	75% P.R. 15% Negro 10% Other
30	60/60	100%	2	30%	20	50/60	Mixed	6	90% P.R. 10% Other

(continued next page)

TABLE IV (continued)

Code # of School	Actual # Capacity	% of Capacity	Attrition of Drop-outs	Registered Children % of Actual Enrollment	Registered Children #	Average Daily Attendance #/Registration	Assignment of Groups by Age	Volunteers Available in Center	Population Served
31	116/120	98%	3	10%	12	90/116	Mixed	None	60% P.R. 35% Negro 5% Other
32	126/120	105%	25	10%	13	84/126	Mixed	1	60% P.R. 38% Negro 2% Other
33	126/120	105%	3	45%	51	110/126	Mixed	5	50% P.R. 50% Negro
34	60/60	100%	3	25%	15	52/60	Mixed	None	100% Chinese
35	54/60	90%	3	10%	5	50/54	Mixed	2	90% P.R. 10% Negro

Key:
*: Capacity noted was increased by 30 after onset of program
**: % refers to current capacity figure
X: Capacity noted was decreased by 30 after onset of program
DNA: Data not available
Z: Reflects 1 special class closed 6th week.

In all instances, the centers reported that they respected the age requirements and the "poverty line". Six and seven year old children were reported attending only under the special recommendation of the local school personnel. They represented only a very small percentage. This late enrollment of children caused centers to violate the plan for structure of groups by age. (see Table IV).

Occasionally a teacher reflected the feeling that the center was not serving the "poverty" population as was intended. Since the evaluating team did not attempt to check the records, this evaluation can offer no information on this area. The following is quoted from an unsolicited letter sent to the coordinator of the evaluation by a volunteer. It is offered verbatim as a particularly sensitive reflection of feelings that have been expressed by others.

> "There was some talk among the personnel that our children were "middle class" and others in the neighborhood perhaps needed Headstart more. There may have been other children who were not and could not be reached. But I wish to emphasize this: the children who did come did not, in the beginning, know a cow, a horse, or even that a carrot, which they knew and ate, was called a carrot. It was obvious they had not been read to. They were fearful of using paints and crayons (fear of getting dirty). Some were afraid of boarding bus. It was apparent to us all that whatever their economic condition, they were culturally deprived and many would be "lost" entering kindergarten in the fall without benefit of Headstart. Also, we had our share of fatherless and foster children and large families. Emotionally, they all seemed to need and responded to affection and the individual attention, that in a small class, they were able to get. Perhaps it might even be said that these children, the ones that came, the parents who sent them, have the best fighting chance in the long run, to fulfill the goals of Headstart. Your social workers may have to study those who didn't come and find out why and if they can be reached."

Petty Cash:

A series of critical comments were offered concerning the lack of allocation for petty cash to be used by the classroom teachers. Teachers felt that there was a flaw in the planning leaving them handicapped to develop such curricular experiences as cooking, planting, etc.

Length of day:

There were requests for the consideration of a longer daily program in the future. Teachers felt that the children would benefit from an extended program and that they might be able to enroll more of the children in acute poverty circumstances. The teachers did not devalue the half day program. They expressed a feeling that there is a need for both kinds of programs in the Child Development Centers.

Overcrowded Buildings:

Some centers faced the problem of cooperating with concurrent programs functioning in the buildings. This critically curtailed the space available for the indoor and outdoor program of the Child Development Center.

Provision of buses for weekly trips:

Each center was provided with a bus each week for children's educational trips. All centers in the sample population reported successful execution of the bus schedules. There was no questioning of this general plan for offering regular bus trips to the youngsters as a vital part of their educational experience. There were concerns expressed relative to the possible variations in the structure of this procedure.

Some centers reported that the bus trips were initiated too soon. The children were not yet ready to venture beyond the school and immediate neighborhoods. Others reported that there was not enough opportunity to select appropriate trips for the individual class groups.

The general reaction, however, was that these trips were one of the most meaningful parts of the program. In lieu of the negative reactions that appeared intermittently, it would seem that the resolution of these problems rests with the professional staff at each center. It appears that some centers related to this part of the program in a rote and unimaginative manner. The bus was scheduled; one of the places was selected arbitrarily from the list; and the morning class went to this destination, followed immediately by the afternoon class. The Board of Education provided the buses and contributed a list of potential trips within a reasonable traveling distance of the center. The professional personnel in those centers that offered complaints on this procedure failed to exercise their professional prerogative in making optimum use of the facility offered.

Section III

Evaluation of the Educational Programs For The Children

There are two sources of data related to the evaluation of the educational programs: (1) the content of the interviews with the professional teaching staff, and (2) the data from the observations of the members of the evaluating team in the 70 classrooms of the sample population.

It is appropriate to review the educational goals of the summer program as described in the project proposal.

> ... the program will be flexibly organized to make optimum use of opportunities for such activities as discussions, rhythms, games and trips, stories and other language experiences. (p 2)
>
> Activities will be planned to foster the development of a better self-image through encouraging self-confidence and creative expression in an environment conducive to child growth and development.
>
> Methods and experiences developing relationships between the child and his immediate environment, the formulation of ideas, concepts and vocabulary will be stressed in this program.
>
> Language experiences will permeate the total environment. (p 3)

Teachers' Perceptions of Educational Accomplishments:

Table V offers a quantitative analysis of the positive results of the summer classroom programs as reported by the teachers. These responses were taken directly from the final interviews which included the following two questions:

1. How do you feel about what you have accomplished with the children this summer? and
2. How do you feel about these accomplishments as compared to your school year program?

Over half of the group teachers specifically identified increased verbal skills for the children as one of the main accomplishments. They reported that they had seen growth in verbal communication skills of the children --much more than anticipated for the eight week period. Teachers cited increase in vocabulary, expression of feelings and ideas, and in general peer group conversation. This growth was correlated to the relaxed program that allowed children to move freely playing, working and socializing accompanied by the high adult-child ratio which offered the children an opportunity to converse with adults on a sustained basis.

The next most frequently cited area of growth dealt with the socialization within a group context. Teachers felt strongly that the majority of the children had developed many of the basic skills for group functioning. They had learned the meaning of taking turns, verbalizing their requests v.s. expressing them physically, establishing reciprocal relationships with their peers, and increasing awareness of the responsibilities of group membership. Teachers described the children as socially withdrawn and timid in the school setting at the onset of the program. All but a few teachers felt that the children had made unusual strides in developing a comfortableness in the classroom and group during the eight week session. Teachers who did not feel

TABLE # 5

Educational Accomplishments of Summer Program and Major Reasons for These Accomplishments, as perceived by the Professional Teaching Staff.

Accomplishments for the Children	# of respondents
1. Increased verbal skills, vocabulary ideas, self-expression	36
2. Improved social skills, interaction with peer groups, taking turns, group awareness and involvement	30
3. Expansion of knowledge and development of concepts	20
4. View school as a happy place to come to and stay	19
5. Increased ability to respond to adult direction and cooperatively participate in school routines	15
6. Increased skills with school tools and materials	13
7. Greater spontaneity, greater initiative	12
8. Greater sense of self: feeling of importance and belonging	9
9. Improved listening skills	7
Other: Exposure to new foods; manners	
Contributing factors:	
1. Small classes coupled with high adult-child ratio	38
2. Quality, interest and dedication of teachers (Head Teacher responses)	22
3. Trip program	22
4. Flexible program free of formal school expecta-	

Table #5 (Cont'd)

Accomplishments	# of respondents
tions and rigid supervision	20
5. Active parent involvement in center activities	10
6. Auxiliary services; psychological, social worker and medical	8
Other: Working in "home" school; professional planning and evaluation meetings (staff meetings, cluster meetings, etc.) equipment.	

that the group as a whole had made a noticeable growth in socialization did express the feeling that individual children had responded very well to the educational experiences, i.e. "I have reached some of the children in the group."

Again, the teachers related these accomplishments to the flexible program and the high adult-child ratio. The feeling was expressed that this program could succeed because there was not the formal school curricular expectation imposed upon them. They were free to develop the activities of the youngsters without concern for a predetermined set of tests to be given, and an established syllabus to follow. Teachers reported that they felt much more relaxed in working with the youngsters during the summer than during the school year. Within this relaxed framework, adults had the opportunity to get to know each child as an individual with a unique set of needs and responses. Teachers felt that they were able to begin to help each child mature comfortably along healthy lines, offering acceptance, understanding and guidance as needed. They were also able to offer intellectual stimulation to the individual children appropriately in terms of both time and content. The children were reported to gain a feeling of being important in this kind of program, and as a result, their self-image improved. They were able to exercise more initiative and respond more freely to the variety of stimulae.

In addition to increased social skills and language development, the staff felt that the trip program offered a great deal of content and stimulation to the children. They related incidents of children's reactions to these expanded experiences that were charming and well illustrated the impact upon them.

The sum total of this educational experience for the children was the discovery that school was a happy place in which to come and to participate. The rooms offered a variety of interesting materials, suitable to their developmental abilities. It also offered playmates of the same age and lots of adults with whom to talk and from whom to get help. In the eyes of the professional staff, this summer's program was worthwhile and accomplished much of its intended goals for the youngsters.

Evaluators' Perceptions of the Educational Accomplishments:

The findings which follow are based upon the observational instruments described in Chapter II.

The most outstanding positive evaluation expressed by the team was that the Child Development Centers offered the youngsters a "nice place to play." The rooms were designed, organized, furnished, equipped and staffed for the children. The daily program was structured for the youngsters. In addition, there was sufficient, but not excessive, number of children of the same age with whom they could interact at any of several acceptable social levels, and within a variety of interest areas. The general conclusion was that these classrooms, with few exceptions, fostered the growth of the participant children. The extent to which growth was enhanced and learnings were expanded is the major consideration.

The most important factors relating to the quality of classroom teaching have already been identified in Sections I and II of this chapter. The process of selecting teachers, licensed by the Board of Education led to the employment of many having no experience or limited experience with the age group specified for participation in the summer program. Additionally, this process failed to eliminate those teachers who were apparently unsuited to teaching this age group. Table VI illustrates that 8-9 teachers (approximately 1/7 of the sample) evidenced that quality of harshness and rejecting behavior with children that is below the acceptable level. For the 240-270 children in these classrooms, the experiences with the authority figure of the school (i.e. the lead teacher in the classroom) must be described as less than positive. The extent of the negative quality of the experience depends primarily upon the individual child... to what degree he became emotionally involved with the authority figure, and to what degree he related to the content, materials and/or the peer group. It can be further stated that in these classrooms which offered poor quality authority figures, the teacher's intellectual stimulation provoked minimal response from the children. There was little observed in these situations that would achieve the goals of Headstart as proposed. Children in these groups generally responded to the total curriculum either passively or with hyper-activity that was destructive in nature.

The majority of group situations which offered the children the opportunity to relate to kindly, interested and supportive adults varied considerably in the quality of intellectual stimulation provided. One third of the group teachers were rated above average within this category of intellectual stimulation: one third were considered average, and one third below average. The reactions from the observation team were stated as follows:

> Some well intentioned teachers did not have the creativity, know-how or direction to change usual methods. Though they gave lip service to the program aims, they did not know how to implement them.
>
> Teachers continually missed teaching opportunities during the free play period. They did not appear to know how to develop the learnings that were being initiated by the children. Yet they were aware of the need to extend the understandings of the youngsters, as demonstrated in the teacher planned group time. They missed those moments when the children were interested and involved, and then attempted to create interest and involvement later on in the total group.

TABLE VI

GENERAL SUMMARY: TEACHING BEHAVIOR

```
Harsh                                                                      Kindly
1                   2                  3                    4                  5
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 
x                   x                 x x        x         x x x   x  x  x   x x
                    x                 x x        x         x x x   x     x   x x
                    x                 x x   x              x x x             x x
                    x                 x x       x          x x x             xx
                    x                 x x         x        x x x            x x
                    x                 x x            x     x x x            x x
                    x                                     x x x
                    x                                     x x x
                                                          x  x

Highly Stimulating                                                           Dull
1                   2                  3                    4                  5
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 
x                  xx      x   x     x x x                  x     x          x x
 x                 xx                x x x        x         xx    x      x   x x
x                  xx                x x x                  xx
 x                 xx           x    x x x    x             xx
x                  xx                x x x    x             xx
 x                 xx                x x x                  xx
x                  x                 x x x                  xx
                                       x                    x

Highly Verbal                                                             Minimal
1                   2                  3                    4                  5
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 
x                   x x     x   x x   x x x     x    x       x               x x
   x                    x                                              x
x  x                x x               x x x     x            x               x
x  x                x x               x x x     x            x
x  x                x x               x x x                  x
x  x                x x               x x x                  x
                    x x               x x x                  x
                    x x               x x x
                    x x                 x
                                        x

Supportive                                                              Rejecting
1                   2                  3                    4                  5
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 
x         x   x   x x x    x   x     x x x       x           x                 x
   x          x   x x x              x x x       x           x
x  x          x   x x x          x   x x x                   x
x  x          x   x x x              x x x                   x
                  x x            x   x x x                   x
x  x                  x
                  x                  x x x
x  x                                 x x x
x  x                                 x x
x  x
```

Teachers rated above average took advantage of many opportunities to talk with the children about what they were doing. But it was noted that these teachers rarely encouraged the individuals to identify and resolve the multitude of "simple" (v.s. complex) problems that they were meeting relative to the on-going activity. The usual method involved the teacher directing the resolution of a problem by dictate: "Put that block over here and the building won't fall down." "Turn the (puzzle) piece around and it will fit." "Pound the clay to get it flat". By observation the teacher usually initiated the identification of the problem and handed the child a quick solution.

In essence, observers found the teachers lacking in the skills of fostering the experimental approach to problem resolution in the use of materials. They continually communicated to the children their personal interest but failed to adequately stimulate and guide their inquiry and discovery of facts and concepts.

Observers found the teachers rarely tried to deal with content areas during the free play period. The content check sheet calling for a numerical count of the responses of the teacher in any content area, (see appendix) average 7-10 checks in a forty-five minute free activity period. Teachers who utilized this period to develop relationships with individual children, focused their attention on general conversation rather on the details of the specific activity with which the child was involved. The children were told, in many little ways, that the teacher was interested in them, aware of them, and enjoyed them... the children were important people. Toward the goal of improving the child's self-concept, this kind of teacher behavior was well directed. Toward the goal of expanding a child's understanding,"ability to think and reason" to solve problems this behavior was insufficient, at times destructive.

The high percentage of kindly, supportive teachers was also reflected in the observers rating of the behavior of the children illustrated on Table VII. In over half of the classrooms, the observers perceived the children viewing the authority figure as one that is helpful and supportive. Similarly, the children appeared to be relaxed and cooperative in relation to the routines, that were most often teacher directed. In establishing a comfortableness for the children in the school setting, which is an orderly structure bounded by routines, a little over half of the class groups observed can be considered successful. Almost one third were rated unsuccessful in achieving this goal. That category which rates the children as obedient in relationship to a teacher-directed routine is considered by the evaluating team as less than adequate achievement relative to this identified goal. Children who are obedient, but not cooperative and relaxed in such routines as clean-up, snack periods, etc., cannot be described as comfortable in this part of the school structure. They may conform as a result of fear of the authority, or as a result of confusion concerning what is to be done. In either case, they are not comfortable with what should be a familiar routine after six weeks (second observational visits scheduled sixth, seventh and eighth weeks).

Teachers demonstrated divergent patterns of guidance in the varying parts of the program. During the free play period, their behavior ranged from no involvement except the execution of the required authority role, to active socialization with individuals and small groups. Occasionally they were observed reading stories to small groups or individuals. The essential goal of this teaching pattern appeared to be the offering to children the freedom to explore materials and ideas without adult intervention.

During the routine periods, the teacher behavior ranged from kindly but firm ordering of children to a rigid, controlling and frequently punitive

TABLE VII

CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR IN THE CLASSROOM

CHILDREN'S REACTION TO AUTHORITY FIGURE (GROUP TEACHER) AS:

Quality		Total
Supportive and Helpful	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x	40
Helpful but NOT Supportive	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x ½ ½ x x x x ½ x x	21½
Indifferent	x ½ ½ ½ x ½	4
Rejecting	x x ½	2½

CHILDREN'S REACTION TO ROUTINES (CLEANUP, JUICE, TOILETING PERIODS):

Quality		Total
Self directed: and Relaxed	x x x x ½ ½ ½ x x x x ½ ½	10½
Teacher directed: Relaxed and Cooperative	x x x ½ x x x ½ x x x x ½ ½ x x x x ½ x x ½ x x x x x x x ½ x x x x ½ ½ x x x	34½
Teacher directed: Obedient	½ x x x x ½ ½ x ½ ½ ½ x x x x ½ ½ ½ x x x	16½
Teacher directed: Resistant	x ½ ½ ½ ½ x ½ ½ x ½	6½

NOTE: ½ refers to those classrooms where children showed evidence of mixed reactions to given quality.

approach. Some teachers who were successful in establishing a warm, supportive relationship with children during the free play period were not able to maintain this quality of relationship in the more structured periods.

During the teacher-directed group activity period, the teachers generally evidenced divergent patterns, but in sequence: (i.e. one teacher demonstrated two distinct approaches within the context of this one period). They were strongly authoritarian in structuring the activity -seating children in group and calling for their attention- and then they tended to be warm and responsive in attempting to guide the learning of the children relative to the selected stimulus. This pattern of attempting to create an exciting learning experience for the total group at a prescribed time in the daily program offered a number of problems for both children and teacher. The structure of small class groups with a high-adult child ratio was intended to provide the teachers and children with an opportunity to develop learnings in small interest groups on a flexible schedule. Teachers appeared to be reluctant to relinquish the pattern of formal learning period in the daily schedule. The small percentage of teachers rated as above average in that quality of "intellectually stimulating behavior reflects the inadequacy of the teaching procedures as developed. (Table VI).

Relative to the educational goals, the centers' greatest success was fostering the feeling of comfortableness in the school setting. The most poorly achieved goal was that of developing the children's ability to think and reason.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, the members of the evaluation team concur in the belief that the educational programs of the Child Development Centers offered a set of experiences to the large majority of participant children that ranged from adequate to good in terms of the goals of the program.

The differential was great between the actual quality of stimulation and guidance by the teachers and the potential quality. Experienced teachers, accustomed to working alone with large groups of children, found it difficult to modify their teaching behavior in order to take optimum advantage of the small class groups and the high adult-child ratio. Inexperienced teachers had difficulty in developing their skills appropriately within the eight week program.

The multitude of problems existant relative to the design and administration of the program by the Board of Education impeded the development of the educational program, but did not cripple it.

The directives for the future relate to two general patterns of problems:

a) Those problems that resulted from the time limitation placed on the Board of Education, requiring that it design, execute and administer this program within a few months:

    1) rapid selection of teachers without refinement in selection procedures or time for appropriate recruitment,
    2) rapid structuring of procedures for equipping and supplying classrooms leading to the variety of limitations in curricular materials as described in Chapter III,
    3) rapid structuring of a professional auxiliary service program resulting in extensive inconsistency and poor execution of roles

b) Those problems that resulted from the administration of this program by a large, complex organization which, in terms of this short program, is handicapped by its size and complexity and-prohibits rapid execution of a variety of functions.

    This slow processing resulted in:

    1) Late delivery of supplies and materials
    2) Slow replacement of personnel (especially secretarial)

3) Late payment of salaries and disbursement of funds
4) Poor articulation between structures operating under the auspices of the Board of Education, i.e. between the regular school staff and the Center staff,
5) Inability to respond rapidly to feedback and to make appropriate adjustments within the eight week period.

Based upon the findings of this evaluation, there are strong directives for change in the future. Within the context of preparation for the summer's activities,

1) the process of selection and orientation of personnel,

2) cooperative planning for housing, equipping and supplying the classrooms,

3) articulation between regular school personnel and the recruitment staff for the summer program,

4) provision for more effective on-going guidance of teaching staff, and

5) more effective utilization of auxiliary professional staff, are clearly identified areas for refinement. This preparation period appears to demand considerably more time than has been allocated in the past. Cooperative relationships based upon a clear understanding of role and responsibility, and a mutual agreement of the importance of this specific program are a must. These types of relationships are not built in a short, intensive and, essentially, impersonal orientation program! Nor are they built through written directives passed down through the heierarchial structure.

Within the realities of the size of the undertaking, it appears that little can be done in the way of further refinement of staff selection procedures. This lack, though, might be balanced by a more effectively designed orientation program that brought center staff together to plan for the summer program under the guidance of a specialist in the field of early childhood education. It would be highly desirable if this same professional could continue to supervise and guide the group or culster groups throughout the summer, thereby eliminating the waste of time involved in having a center staff build a relationship with two specialists, one for orientation and one for on-going supervision.

A further check on the accepted limitations of selection procedures could be offered by this type of orientation program. The professional leadership in these orientation groups would have an opportunity to identify those staff members who demonstrate a lack of suitability to the assigned role and replace them before the onset of the program. Further, those center groups which contain individuals who are unable, for a variety of reasons, to establish a cooperative working relationship could be reorganized.

Within the context of the administration of this program by a very large and existing educational structure, the challenges seem more difficult to resolve. It would appear that the Board of Education needs to find ways to expedite the slow processes that have so impeded this summer's program. A large organization responds slowly to the identified problems. An eight week summer program cannot survive and achieve its goal within this large structure unless provision is made for rapid response to feedback.

CORRECTIVE READING IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Research Director:

Dr. Sydney Schwartz, Group Leader, Heat Start, Teachers College, Columbia University

Research Staff:

Mrs. Charlotte Brody, Director of Lower School Project, Little Red Schoolhouse

Mrs. Clare Lawrence, Director of Grant Day Care Center, Manhattanville Community Centers

Mrs. Florence Lieberman, Doctoral Candidate, Columbia University, School of Social Work; Social Worker, New York City; Consultant, Mend- East Harlem Poverty Project

Dr. Bernice Mc Claren, Assistant Professor of Education, Southern Illinois University

Mrs. Selma Sapir, Doctoral Candidate at Teachers College, Columbia University, School Psychologist, Scarsdale Public School

Mrs. Glenda Schusterman, Doctoral Candidate in Sociology, Columbia University; Instructor in Sociology, Adelphi College

Mrs. Marguerette Ward, Director of Manhattanville Community Centers, Inc.

4

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, NYC

July 12, 1966

Division of Educational Practices
Title I Evaluations

PRE-SCHOOL CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS (HEADSTART)

Dr. Sydney L. Schwartz, Project Coordinator

SCHOOL DATA SHEET

Evaluator ______________________

Date ______________________

NUMBER OF SCHOOL ____________________
Location: Street ____

Borough ____

Enrollment capacity: ____________________________________

% of capacity filled ________________________________

Groups:

	AGE	SIZE OF CLASS	NO. OF BOYS	NO. OF GIRLS
A.M.				
P.M.				

Ethnic composition of the enrolled population: ________________________
____

Number of Drop Outs: ____________________

Average Daily Attendance ________________

UD 002 466 (2d part)

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42/ New York 10036

Division of Educational Practices
Title I Evaluations

Pre-School Child Development Centers (HEADSTART)

SCHOOL KEY

Evaluator ____________________

Date ____________________

School Number ____________________

Address: Street ____________________

Boro ____________________

Name of Head Teacher ____________________

Group No. 1 Teacher ____________________

Assistant Teacher ____________________

Volunteer ____________________

Group No. 2 Teacher ____________________

Assistant Teacher ____________________

Aide ____________________

Volunteer ____________________

DO NOT FILL IN

Code # ____________

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

THIS SECTION TO BE FILLED OUT BY COORDINATOR

STAFF DATA SHEET

No. of School:__________ Evaluator:__________

Date:__________

No. of Tchrs:______ No. of Asst. Tchrs.______ No. of Aides ______

Volunteers ______

HEAD TEACHER: Male:______ Female______

NYC License: ECE______ Common Branches______

No. Yrs. Experience with PK and K:__________

No. Yrs. Experience Elem. Grades: __________

NYC HEADSTART Experience: Summer '65______

Schl. Yr. '65-6______

Other HEADSTART experience: __________

Regular school assign: No. of School __________

Location: Street & Boro__________

(Area)__________

Grade assign:__________

Resident area: (Identify by common name & boro:
(i.e., Prospect Park, Bklyn.)

____

GROUP NO. 1

Group Teacher Male:______ Female______

NYC License: ECE ______ Common Branches______

No. Yrs. Experience with PK and K:__________

No. Yrs. Experience, Elem. Grades:__________

NYC HEADSTART Experience: Summer '65______

Schl. Yr. '65-6______

STAFF DATA SHEET (cont'd)

Other HEADSTART Experience: ______________________________

Regular school assign:

No. of School ______________

Location: Street & Boro. (area) ______________

Grade assign.: ______________

____

Resident area: (Identify by common name & boro: (i.e., Prospect Park, Bklyn.)

____

Assistant Teacher:

Educational background: (name of high schl) ______________________________

Name of College ______________________

No. of Yrs. Completed ______________

Major ______________________

Experience with Children ______________________________

Male ________ Female ____________

Resident Area ______________________

Aide:

Male ______________ Female ______________

Resident Area: ______________

Highest educational attainment ______________________

Volunteer:

Male ______________ Female ______________

Previous HEADSTART experience ______________________________

Volunteer from agency: (If so, state name of agency) ______________

____

Resident Area: ______________________________

To Be Filled in On Final Visit:

Attendance Record of Staff: ______________________________

STAFF DATA SHEET

GROUP NO. 2

Group Teacher Male__________ Female______________

NYC License: ECE______________Common Branches______________

No. Yrs. Experience with PK and K:______________________________

No. Yrs. Experience, Elem. Grades:______________________________

NYC HEADSTART Experience: Summer '65______________

Schl. Yrs. '65-6______________

Other HEADSTART Experience:______________________________

Regular school assign: No. of School______________________

Location: Street & Boro. (area)

____

Grade assign:______________________

____

Resident area: (Identify by common name & boro: (i.e., Prospect Park, Bklyn.)

____

Assistant Teacher:

Educational background: (name of High Schl)____________________

Name of College______________________

No. of Yrs. Completed______________________

Major______________________________

Experience with Children______________________________

Male__________ Female__________ Resident Area______________

Aide:

Male______________ Female____________________

Resident Area:______________________

Highest educational attainment__________________________

STAFF DATA SHEET (cont'd)

Volunteer: Male__________ Female__________

Previous HEADSTART experience____________________

Volunteer from agency (If so, name of agency)______________

____

Resident Area________________________

To be Filled in On Final Visit:

Attendance Record of Staff:____________________________

HOUSING AND EQUIPMENT

Indoors: School rooms Utilized:

No. of kindergartens: ____________

No. of grades ____________

Comments: (space problems, if any) ____________

General Equipment	Available	Adequate
Blocks and Construction		
Block accessories		
Housekeeping materials		
Dramatic play materials		
Water Play Materials		
Manipulative materials		
Woodworking Materials		
Science tools and materials		
Language development materials		

Games ____________

Books ____________

Puppets ____________

	Available	Adequate
Arts and Crafts materials		
Music:		

Instruments ____________

Phonograph ____________

Piano ____________

	Available	Adequate
Other On Convenience		

NOTE: Comments of toilet facilities and sinks:

Outdoor: Equipment:	Available	Adequate
Climbing		
Construction		
Sand box and tools		
Water Play		
Wheel toys		
Balls, ropes, etc.		
Other		

General brief description of outdoor area: accessibility to classrooms, shaded areas (if any) ____________

Alternative: Use of local park: (distance from school) ____________

Name of park ____________

INTERVIEW GUIDE

TEACHERS AND HEAD TEACHERS

Initial Interview:

1. What do you hope to accomplish with the children in the Summer Program?

2. How will you do this?

3. What obstacles are there likely to be in the way of accomplishing your goals?

4. If these obstacles do arise, what do you think you will do?

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, NYC

Division of Educational Practices
Title I Evaluation

PRE-SCHOOL CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

Definition of Categories (for Evaluator)

I. Instructional Moves

1. Demonstration

1a) Model to copy: Teacher shows children an example of object, motion or verbal expression with stated or implied direction to duplicate or imitate: might include step by step instructions accompanied by illustration:

ex. (1) sample basket (teacher made) shown to children to copy.

(2) teacher shows children how to write name by doing so first.

(3) teacher shows children how to skip and then watches them try.

Distinguished from collaborative effort by teacher's act of non-participation in children's attempt to imitate, duplicate and/or copy.

1b) Model for children's elaboration: teacher introduces procedures, actions, illustrations of an idea or concept with opportunity for children to pursue individual exploration and experimentation: accompanied by direct or implied suggestion that the children try it for themselves - with adequate provision of materials.

ex. (1) introduction of magnet and how it works; children directed to explore further
(2) introduction of the concept of buoyancy with examples; children directed to explore further

Distinguished from (1a) in that children are encouraged to expand the concept through additional exploration rather than repetition of identical experience with identical tools.

1c) Illustrative: teacher shows the objective representation of a verbal statement

ex. (1) "A ball is round", teacher holds up ball.
(2) Colors: "This is read", red paper, etc.
(3) Animal sounds.

2. Collaboration:

   a) Teacher directed and controlled: teacher is decision maker and teacher and child work together on one object of action, with teacher determining the direction of activity and sequence of actions.

      ex. (1) Distribution of napkins: teacher and child work together while teacher explains, shows, or directs the placement of each napkin.

      (2) puzzle: teacher and child assembling puzzle: teacher puts some pieces in and directs placement of others.

      (3) woodworking: teacher and child work together; involved teacher instructs or demonstrates steps in the process.

   b) Teacher assisted and encouraged: child is decision maker; teacher and child work together on one object or action, with teacher aiding process by appropriate questions and suggestions to identify the problems and solutions; offering praise and encouragement to continue.

      ex. (1) Distribution of napkins: teacher helps child decide appropriate number and placement.

      (2) puzzle: teacher helps child; taking turns putting pieces in; directing attention to appropriate clues of shape and color for successful placement; praise.

      (3) woodworking: child determines process as teacher offers physical assistance; teacher raises questions; give suggestions to aid; praise.

3. Verbal

   a. Reading: reading verbatim of any written matter; stories, directions, labels.

   b. Introductory: verbal techniques used by teacher to focus children's attention upon and to interest children in a group learning experience: ex: recalling experiences to date, questions to children, summaries.

   c. Non-transactional: giving information, ideas, explanations, or relating stories to children without request for or relative to children's responses.

   d. Transactional: evolving discussions, explanations, stories combining the efforts of teachers and children as participants.

II. Behavioral Moves

4. Dealing with feelings

a. Positive: teacher comments, remarks, utterances that serve to aid child's feeling of acceptance, belonging, adequacy: not specifically directed to change in behavior.

ex. (1) teacher comments upon the dress, grooming of child, "What a pretty dress you're wearing!"

(2) teacher acceptance of individual feelings, preferences, attitudes.

(3) teacher approval through remarks "that's nice", smiles, or physical affection.

b. Neutral: Neither acceptance nor rejection of children's action, comments, expressions. No response, or neutral comment, as "Is that so?"

c. Negative: teacher rejection of individual expressions, preferences, attitudes without identifiable instructional act: distinguished from (5c) by lack of immediate social behavioral referent.

ex. (1) child: "I don't like my mommy today."

Teacher: "That's not nice. All children love their mommies."

(2) Child looks tearful.
Teacher: "Don't be a crybaby."

5. Controlling Behavior

a. Positive: teacher guidance of child in a destructive social relationship that aids in development of self-control, or provides alternative patterns of problem resolution: guidance projects the quality of an emotionally supportive relationship as against a rejecting, punitive relationship, includes physical controls, verbal guidance and limit setting behavior directed toward helping child function more adequately within the group structure.

b. Neutral: No action toward behavioral control.

ex. (1) teacher sees 2 children fighting. Does nothing.
(2) children screaming and yelling at each other; no teacher action.

c. Negative: teacher attempts control of child behavior through threatening, punitive and rejecting responses: frequently judgmental.

ex. (1) Teacher: "Johnny, stop that! you're a naughty boy!"

(2) Teacher: "Johnny, get away. You're just a nuisance."

(3) Teacher: "Why aren't you a good boy, like Johnny?"

6. Arrangements: teacher direction of routines; eating, toileting, dressing, clean-up with no identifiable instructional move.

III. Non-instructional Moves

7. Teacher activity: conversation with other adults; fixing materials for children, recording behavior; non-interactive with children.

8. Passive behavior:

a. observing: watching children

b. uninvolved: personal grooming, reading, looking out window.

Note:

Developed as part of a curriculum research program under the direction of Professor Kenneth Wann and Professor Helen Robison at Teachers College, Columbia, University.

TEACHER PROFILE

Program context: (i.e. free play, routines, group activity)	1 Min.	1 Min.	1 Min.	1 Min.	1 Min.	1 Min.
I. INSTRUCTIONAL MOVES						
1. Demonstration:						
a. Model to copy						
b. Model for child's elaboration						
c. Illustrative						
2. Collaboration:						
a. Teacher directed and controlled						
b. Teacher assisted and encouraged						
3. Verbal:						
a. Reading						
b. Introductory						
c. Non-transactional						
d. Transactional						
II. BEHAVIORAL MOVES						
4. Dealing with Feelings:						
a. Positive						
b. Neutral						
c. Negative						
5. Controlling Behavior						
a. Positive						
b. Neutral						
c. Negative						
6. Arrangements (Children, materials, transition)						
III. NON-INSTRUCTIONAL MOVES						
7. Teacher Activity						
8. Passive behavior:						
a. Observing						
b. Uninvolved						

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Division of Educational Practices
Title I Evaluations

Pre-School Child Development Centers (HEADSTART)

CHILDREN IN THE CLASSROOM

EVALUATOR____________________

Date____________________

School____________________

Class (Name of Teacher____________________

A.M.______ P.M.______

Age Group____________________

Duration of Observation____________________

Note: This is an open-ended reaction page which should include generally such items as the flexibility in scheduling; ease of movement in the classroom; relationship to materials and other children; level of tension and relaxation noted; etc. Substantiate your reactions with illustrations of objective behavior observed. This form is still experimental and you have the option to use your judgment.

REMEMBER, this sheet should be restricted to children's behavior. We take a good look at the teaching behavior via the other instrument.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

Division of Educational Practices
Title I Evaluations

General Summary: Teacher Behavior

Harsh ....Kindly

1	2	3	4	5

Highly stimulating ....Dull

1	2	3	4	5

Highly verbal .... Minimal

1	2	3	4	5

Supportive...Rejecting

1	2	3	4	5

Date ____________________ School ____________________

Teacher ____________________

Observer ____________________

EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS

Number of school________

Date ____________

Evaluator______________

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

Pre-School Child Development Centers

SCHOOL DATA SHEET II

Number of School________________

School Location ____

____

Average Daily Attendance________________________________

Comments____

Number of Dropouts____

Comments____

____

____

Psychologist available? Yes____ No ______ If yes, days per week________

Comments ____ Days per week ____________________________________

____

____

Social worker available? Yes____ No ______ If yes, days per week________

Comments____

____

____

-continued -

Number of school__________
Date __________
Evaluator__________

SCHOOL DATA SHEET II (continued)

Psychiatrist available? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, days per week__________

Comments__________

Medical Staff:	Title	Days per week
1.		
2.		
3.		

Comments__________

Outside medical services (dental, health, etc.): Give name of agencies__________

Comments__________

Description of community served (families). Please be specific.__________

Center for Urban Education
Title I Evaluation
Pre-School Child Develo . Centers

No. of School______
Date of Visit ______
Evaluator______________

% of children who have attended school before ________

Center for Urban Education
Title I Evaluations
Pre-School Child Dev. Centers

number of school ____________
date ____________
evaluator ____________

"Questionnaire for Assistant Teachers"

As active participants of the Head Start program we value your comments. We are interested in your appraisal of the Head Start program, in the following areas:

1. What do you see as the most crucial needs of the children in your group this summer? ____________

2. In what ways did your class program meet these needs? ____________

3. In your estimation, in terms of the children, what is your feeling about the best part of this program? Comments ____________

Similarly, what is your feeling about the poorest part of this program? Comments. ____________

Title I Evaluations
Pre-School Child Development Centers

Questionnaire for Assistant Teachers
-page 2 -

number of school__________

date______________

Evaluator______________

4. How do you feel about your supervision?______________________

School No.________________ Date of Visit__________ Evaluator__________________

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Family Worker:

1. How do you feel about the Head Start program in terms of meeting the needs of this community? Does it, and how?

2. In your opinion, how do you think the general community looks at Head Start programs? Are they aware of them, understand them, appreciate them?

Note to Evaluator: - Commit these questions to memory and use a small pad to take notes. Do not use the packet when interviewing family worker.

Center for Urban Education
Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations
Pre-School Child Dev. Centers

number of school____________

date____________

evaluator____________

Second Section

"Head Teacher"

1. What do you see has contributed most to the success of this summer's program, in terms of offering a good educational experience to the children?

Comments:____________

2. What do you see has interfered the most in setting up good educational experiences? i.e. Biggest problem?

Comments____________

School No. ________ Date of Visit ____________ Evaluator ______________________

SECOND SECTION

TEACHER ______________________________

1. How do you feel about what you have accomplished with the children this summer?

COMMENTS ______________________________

2. How do you feel about this program accomplished with the children this summer compared to your school year teaching program?

COMMENTS: ______________________________

Number of school______
Date of visit________
Evaluator_______________

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

PRE-SCHOOL CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

CONTENT OF CURRICULUM AS INDICATED BY TEACHER BEHAVIOR

Instructions: check frequency of teacher responses in any/all areas:

A. Science: 1. Physical Science. (a) facts_______________
(b) concepts_______________
2. Natural Science. (a) facts_______________
(b) concepts_______________

B. Mathematics: 1. Counting _______________
2. Size relationships & comparisons_______________
3. Quantities (bulk) & comparison_______________

C. Communication Skills:

1. Classification (check content area also)_______________
2. Auditory discrimination_______________
3. Visual discrimination_______________
4. Vocabulary expansion:
    Names of common objects_______________
    Descriptive words_______________
    Concepts_______________
5. Sentence structure_______________
6. Listening skills _______________

D. Social Science:

1. Expansion in factual knowledge of community & cultural patterns_______________
2. Comparative cultural values _______________

E. Manners: _______________

F. Physical Education & Health_______________

No. of School________

Date of Visit_______

Evaluator_____________

CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR

A. FREE PLAY:

Child - child: play pattern: parallel______cooperative______

group awareness_______________

communication: verbal_________

non-verbal_________

mobility______

comments____

____

____

____

Child-materials: involvement and completion,

self-selection and appropriateness, conventional usage

destructive__________ constructive________

comments____

____

____

____

Child- authority: supportive and helpful_______

helpful and not supportive_______

indifferent________

rejecting_______

comments____

____

____

____

B. ROUTINES:

self-directed and relaxed_______

teacher-directed but relaxed and cooperative_______

teacher-directed, obedient_______

teacher-directed, resistant_______

comments____

____

____

____

C. GROUP ACTIVITY:

cooperative and involved_______

cooperative but not involved________

resistant_______

teacher-directed______ emergent_________

comments____

____

____

____

TEACHER PROFILE

Program context: (i.e. free play, routines,group activity)	1 Min.	1 Min.	1 Min.	1 Min.	1 Min.	1 Min.
I. INSTRUCTIONAL MOVES						
1. Demonstration:						
a. Model to copy						
b. Model for child's elaboration						
c. Illustrative						
2. Collaboration:						
a. Teacher directed and controlled						
b. Teacher assisted and encouraged						
3. Verbal:						
a. Reading						
b. Introductory						
c. Non-transactional						
d. Transactional						
II. BEHAVIORAL MOVES						
4. Dealing with Feelings:						
a. Positive						
b. Neutral						
c. Negative						
5. Controlling Behavior						
a. Positive						
b. Neutral						
c. Negative						
6. Arrangements (Children, materials, transition)						
III. NON-INSTRUCTIONAL MOVES						
7. Teacher Activity						
8. Passive behavior:						
a. Observing						
b. Uninvolved						

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

Division of Educational Practices
Title I Evaluations

General Summary: Teacher Behavior

Harsh				Kindly
1	2	3	4	5

Highly stimulating				Dull
1	2	3	4	5

Highly verbal				Minimal
1	2	3	4	5

Supportive				Rejecting
1	2	3	4	5

Date ______________________ School ______________________

Teacher ______________________

Observer ______________________